




32692

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

*Approved & entry  
6/1/04*Patent  
Case No.: 56522US002

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: GEHRING, THOMAS R.

Application No.: 09/827,774

Group Art Unit: 2851

Filed: March 30, 2001

Examiner: Mahoney, Christopher

Title: SCREENS AND METHODS FOR DISPLAYING INFORMATION

*#1 Response  
KCC  
6/14/04*RESPONSECommissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on:	
<u>3-20-03</u>	<u>Kim Elfstrom</u>
Date	Signed by: Kim Elfstrom

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the outstanding Office Action, mailed September 27, 2003, in the above-identified application. An one month extension of time is required, such extension is hereby requested. Please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

RECEIVED  
APR 1 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Remarks

This is in response to the Examiner's action mailed September 27, 2002. In that action the Examiner rejected claims 1 through 30 and 32 through 40 and has objected to claim 31. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that any of the claims, as amended, are properly rejectable

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for claiming subject matter not enabled by the teaching of the specification. Specifically, the Examiner states that the applicants have "not taught how to make or use a screen which is easy to manually cut so as to customize the size." The applicants respectfully disagree. Those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that flexible plastic films of the sort taught in the specification would typically be easily manually cut. Furthermore, the applicants have included five examples in the specification. Each of these examples includes a film that would be easy to manually cut. Clearly, this provides enablement for this limitation. The Examiner also asked where "the specification discusses